

**BOBBY MALONE,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:17-CV-178 (MTT)**

**WARNER ROBINS POLICE**

**DEPARTMENT, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

On June 16, 2017, the Court dismissed Plaintiff Bobby Malone’s claims without prejudice because the statute of limitations ran on them at least two decades ago. Doc. 17 at 3. On June 21, 2017, Plaintiff Bobby Malone filed a letter in response, which he requested be treated “as a motion for reconsideration.” Doc. 18 at 1.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration *shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.*” M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6 (emphasis added). Indeed, “[r]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.” *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at \*1 (M.D. Ga.) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It “is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.” *Id.* “In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate [his] prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived.” *McCoy v. Macon Water Authority*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

Malone seeks reconsideration on the ground that: “[His] Civil Rights were violated by the legal establishments and [his] civil and Inalienable Rights were granted by GOD, and have been violated by the courts.” Doc. 18 at 1. And: “[He] didn't know that either of these rights had a time limit that barred justice being done.” This does not warrant reconsideration. Malone’s claims are clearly barred by the statute of limitations. Malone’s motion (Doc. 18) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 30th day of June, 2017.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT